



Application No. 09/681,304

RD28435

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited in the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231 on 22 January 2003.  
Typed or printed name: Ann M. Agosti  
Signature: Ann M. Agosti

#13C And  
M. Brunson  
2/5/03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Saia et al. : Group Art Unit: 2814  
Application No. 09/681,304 : Examiner: DiLinh Nguyen  
Filed: 15 March 2001 : Response to Paper No. 10  
For **Microelectromechanical System  
Device Package and Packaging Method**

**Preliminary Amendment for Request for Continuing Prosecution**

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, DC 20231

RECEIVED  
JAN 31 2003  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2814

Please rewrite claims 2, 4, and 6 as follows.

C1

2 (twice amended). The method of claim 1 further comprising providing MEMS vias through the MEMS package flexible layer and the cover extending to connection pads of the MEMS device and applying a MEMS pattern of electrical conductors over the MEMS package flexible layer and the cover and extending through the MEMS vias to the connection pads.

C2

4 (twice amended). The method of claim 3 wherein attaching the MEMS device comprises using the adhesive.

C3

6 (twice amended). The method of claim 1, wherein the adhesive comprises a mixture of photodielectric and epoxy materials.

**Remarks**

On 22 November 2002, Applicants submitted a notice of appeal from the final rejection of claims 1-4, 6-8, 16, and 19. Claims 1-4, 6 and 16 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) on Gorowitz et al., US Patent No. 5,757,072 (hereinafter Gorowitz) in view of Noddin, US Patent No. 5,731,047; and claims 7-8 and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) on Gorowitz and Noddin and further in view of Saia et al., US Patent No. 6,150,719 (hereinafter Saia). Claims 5, 9-15, 17-18, and 20-25 were canceled in earlier amendments.

An amendment filed after final rejection was not entered in Advisory Action Paper No. 10.

Applicants had submitted the amendment to attempt to correct a small matter of form in claims 4 and 6. Claims 2, 4, and 6 had originally depended, either directly or indirectly, from